

## **REMARKS**

**[0002]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. The status of the claims is as follows:

- Claims 1-11, 13, 15, 16, 18-20, and 26-29 are currently pending,
- Claims 1, 13, and 26-28 are amended herein, and
- Claims 22-25 are canceled herein.

**[0003]** Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in Applicant's Specification at least in Figure 10 and the corresponding description.

### **Cited Documents**

**[0004]** The following documents have been applied to reject one or more claims of the Application:

- Yellepeddy: Yellepeddy, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0145003
- Thatcher: Thatcher et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,061,743

### **Yellepeddy Fails to Anticipate Claims 1-2, 8, 13, 19-20, 22, and 26**

**[0005]** Claims 1-2, 8, 13, 19-20, 22, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Yellepeddy. In response, Applicant has amended the claims and, as amended, the claims are allowable over the cited documents.

Independent Claim 1

**[0006]** In light of the amendments presented herein, Applicant submits that the rejection of independent claim 1 is moot. Specifically, Yellepeddy does not disclose at least the claimed:

discovering, by the computing device, a format of a corresponding reference attribute in the third external object, the reference attribute and corresponding reference attribute having different formats and the format of the corresponding reference attribute being associated with an attribute in the central representation of the second object; and

propagating, by the computing device, the changed data to the third namespace to update the third external object, the propagating including retrieving a value of the attribute in the central representation of the second object and updating a value of the corresponding reference attribute in the third external object based on the retrieved value.

**[0007]** Rather, the passages of Yellepeddy cited by the Examiner simply describe a metadirectory that joins tables from multiple databases for the same object (see paragraph 49). While values of the same object attribute may have slight variations in different databases (e.g., Robert Smith in one database, Bob Smith in another), Yellepeddy does not take into account different formats for permutations of an attribute (e.g., one format requiring a name and another requiring an email alias – see the paragraph beginning at page 21, line 22 of Applicant's Specification for an example of different formats of a reference attribute). Rather, Yellepeddy simply replicates each variation and treats those variations as unrelated data (see Yellepeddy paragraphs 27 and 28). Claim 1, in contrast, requires that a value of “an attribute in the central representation of the second object” which is associated with the format of the attribute receiving the change be retrieved. No such association or retrieval is described anywhere in Yellepeddy.

**[0008]** Consequently, Yellepeddy does not disclose all of the elements and features of this claim. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Yellepeddy does not anticipate this claim, and respectfully requests that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn.

*Independent Claims 13, 22, and 26*

**[0010]** Claim 22 is canceled, obviating its rejection.

**[0011]** Claims 13 and 26 are allowable over Yellepeddy for at least the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1.

*Dependent Claims 2, 8, 19, and 20*

**[0012]** Claims 2, 8, 19, and 20 ultimately depend from one of independent claims 1 or 13. As discussed above, claims 1 and 13 are not anticipated by Yellepeddy. Therefore, claims 2, 8, 19, and 20 are also patentable over Yellepeddy for at least their dependency from a patentable base claim. These claims may also be patentable for the additional features that each recites.

**Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, and 27-29 are Non-Obvious Over Yellepeddy in view of Thatcher**

**[0013]** Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, 23-25, and 27-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious over Yellepeddy and further in view of Thatcher. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

**[0014]** Claims 23-25 are canceled, obviating their rejections.

**[0015]** Claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, and 27-29 depend from claims 1, 13, and 26, respectively, incorporating their recitations. As discussed above, Yellepeddy lacks features of independent claims 1, 13, and 26. Further, Thatcher does not cure the above discussed deficiencies of Yellepeddy and is not cited as doing so. Thus, claims 1, 13, and 26 would remain patentable even if Thatcher were combined with Yellepeddy to reject those claims.

**[0016]** Thus, claims 3-7, 9-11, 15, 16, 18, and 27-29 are patentable over Yellepeddy and Thatcher for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 13, and 26 are patentable over Yellepeddy and Thatcher.

## **Conclusion**

**[0017]** Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and prompt issuance of the application. If any issues remain that prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned representative for the Applicant before issuing a subsequent Action.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC  
Representative for Applicant

/Robert C. Peck/  
Robert C. Peck(robpe@leehayes.com; 206-876-6019)  
Registration No. 56826

Dated: December 30, 2009

David A. Divine (daved@leehayes.com; 509-944-4733)  
Registration No. 51275